

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 15-29 are now pending in the referenced application. The claims 1-14 have been cancelled as non-elected claims in response to previous restriction requirements. Claims 24-29 are newly added dependent claims.

Response to the Examiner's Detailed Action is detailed in remarks hereinbelow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 102

Claims 15-23 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by English (US 3,453,476).

The independent claim 15 is rejected on the basis that:

"...**English ('476) teaches** a filament assembly for incandescent light sources (**figure 1**), the filament assembly comprising: a filament having a first spud coil at a first end (**4**; **see figure 1; column 2 line 24 to column 2 line 19**) and a second spud coil at a second end (**4**); a first lead wire having an inner cut end that is screwed into the first spud coil (**also labeled 4; see figure 2**) and a second lead wire having an inner cut end that is screwed into the second spud coil (**also labeled 4; see figures 1 and 2**); and at least one spur near the end of the first lead wire's inner cut end (**not numbered, see figure 1, and Encarta definition 3 of spur**), and at least one spur near the end of the second lead wire's inner cut end (**other side of figure 1**), wherein each of the spurs protrudes laterally beyond a perimeter of the respective first and second lead wires and engages with turns of the respective first and second spud coils (**see figures 1 and 2**)."
(Examiner's notations are in bold font, the remainder of the text being copied from Applicant's claim 15).

I find the following Encarta definition (http://encarta.msn.com/dictionary/_spur.html) for the word *spur* as a noun: "*3. projection: something that projects outward at an angle from a larger object*". Examiner further states that "the spur is lead wire projecting out of pinch seal 5 (column 2 lines 24-27) at an angle of 180°."

In response, Applicant respectfully submits that English's figure 1 and column 2 lines 28-

33 clearly teach a filament having a single coiled end or leg (3 not 4) "fitted tightly" onto an inner lead or spud (4) which extends into a pinch seal (5). It should be apparent that Applicant's "lead wire" corresponds to English's inner lead (4), and that Applicant's "spud coil at the end of the filament" corresponds to English's single coiled end or leg (3) on a filament. Given this, it is a logical contradiction to assert that Applicant's spur (claimed as being "near the end of the ... lead wire's inner cut end... protruding laterally beyond a perimeter of the ... lead wire") is equivalent to the "lead wire (4) projecting out of pinch seal (5)". The lead wire cannot also be a spur "projecting outward at an angle (Encarta)" from itself. Furthermore, Applicant claims a spur that "protrudes laterally" from the lead wire, not straight ahead at 180°. (In addition, claim 20 makes it clear that such a 180° projection is called a "longitudinally directed point" rather than a spur.) In general, I believe that a common understanding of the term spur is that it is a projection in a direction that is at a non-zero (= non-180°) angle to the axis or surface of a larger object. In other words, the Encarta definition uses the word "angle" in the sense of "non-parallel" or "non-tangential", which is a common meaning of the term.

Finally, English ('476) clearly does **not** teach or disclose any form of spur laterally protruding from the lead wire (4) that engages with turns (a, b, c, d) of the ... spud coil (3).

Allowability of the independent claim 15 as argued, will mean that the claims 16-23 depending from it should also be allowable, making Examiner's arguments concerning claims 16-23 moot. Nevertheless, among other arguments that could be made, Applicant at least wishes to note that the above arguments concerning claim 15 also apply to claims 20 and 22.

New Claims

Claims 24-29, all depending from claim 15, are hereby added in order to include some of the invention aspects that were originally claimed in claims 1-14, but have been canceled due to restriction election. Since they are dependent claims, the new claims' allowability follows from that of claim 15.

The new claims are all supported by the original claims as follows, the only changes being grammatical, not substantial:

Claims 24-26 are supported by claims 4-6, respectively.

Claims 27-29 are supported by claims 12-14, respectively.

Conclusion

The undersigned Agent of Record has made a sincere effort to respond to the rejections of the present Office Action. Applicant believes that the original claims define novel structure which is non-obvious. Favorable re-examination and consideration are respectfully requested. If there are still some issues to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/D. A. Stauffer/ June 22, 2006

Dwight A. Stauffer

Registration No. 47,963

1006 Montford Rd.
Cleveland Hts., OH 44121
216-381-6599 (ph/fax)
dastauffer@core.com